

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In response to the office action dated February 12, 2007, applicants have amended claim 1, and designated claim 34 as "withdrawn" as depending from a withdrawn claim. Thus, Claims 1, 16-25, 27-28, 32-33 remain pending for examination, and claims 2-7 and 9-15 and 34 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In the February 12, 2007 Office Action, the examiner rejected Claims 1, 16-25, 27 and 28 under 35 USC 112, 2nd ¶, rejected claims 1, 16-25 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Groves (US 3, 482,733), and rejected claims 27, 28, 32 and 33 under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Groves.

Addressing each of these rejections in turn:

Claims 1, 16-25, 27 and 28 comply with 35 USC 112, 2nd ¶.

Claim 1 has been amended to define with more specificity "the ends" referred to.

Claim 16 has been amended to better define the arrangement of a plurality of carriers as claimed in claim 1, to be presented in series, so as to form to a multi-unit form carrier.

As Claim 16 is believed to be sufficiently definite, then those claims dependent thereon as also believed to be equally definite.

Withdrawal of the 112 rejection is therefore submitted to be appropriate.

Claims 1, 16-25 are Novel over Groves

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a carrier, "wherein the first portion and second portion are different areas of single ribbon which makes up the elongate strip", and in which "the edges of a closed pocket or pouch for containment of medicament" are formed by a fold and a join provided to a first portion and a second portion of a single elongate strip.

It is submitted that the carrier of the present invention as defined by independent claim 1 is fundamentally different from a conventional blister pack, in which a carrier strip having blister pockets provided thereto is provided with a cover strip that is sealed thereto to form closed blister pockets.

In essence, the carrier of the present invention is simpler than such conventional blister packs because it comprises only a single elongate strip (i.e., a single ribbon of strip) of rather than separate and distinct carrier and cover strips that must be aligned together and sealed to form the closed blister pockets thereof.

Independent claim 32 furthermore defines a method of making the carrier of the present invention from a single elongate strip.

The Examiner's rejections are based on Groves (US 3,482,733) a patent directed to improvements in a completely different application, for articles dispensing in for example, washing machines or coin operated dispensers (col. 1, lines 32-33, 48). Applicant would respectfully assert that the medicinal and vending dispenser fields are sufficiently unrelated that one skilled in the art would not be directed by the teachings of Groves.

Regardless of the appropriate field of art of Groves, Groves relates to a conventional blister pack which is made up of two distinct components, a base

strip 18 and a cover strip 19. The base strip 18 has blisters formed in it, and the cover strip 19 is laid over the base strip. The base and cover strips are then sealed together to define closed compartments 20 (see col. 3, lines 71-74). It is thus, from the outset, submitted that Groves would not direct a skilled person to the medicament carrier of the present invention, as in claim 1 of our application, the edges of a closed pocket or pouch are formed by a fold and a join provided to a first portion and a second portion of a single elongate strip.

Moreover, Groves lacks a fold as claimed, i.e. a "fold between the first and the second portions" of a single strip. While the examiner has identified the "fold" in the diagram submitted in the February 12 office action, this fold is within one of the two components making up the strip, i.e., the carrier portion, and is not a fold "between" the first portion and second portion as claimed in claim 1.

Groves, contrary to what is claimed in the present application, provides reverse guidance in regard to use of a single elongate strip, instead Groves explicitly motivates the use of a conventional blister pack form in which separate and distinct base and cover strips must be aligned together and sealed to form closed compartments.

There are additional points that distinguish Groves from the claims of this application. Contrary to the examiner's statements, Groves fails to mention medicament. The numerical reference 16 in Groves relates to an "article or pellet." As Groves is directed to washing machines and coin operating vending machines, one could assume these articles are likely clothes washing detergent. There is certainly no clear description of a medicament.

Additionally, the examiner suggests that first 24 and second 25 portions of the base strip 18 of Groves are provided with folds and join to form the edges of a pocket or pouch. It is submitted that this is necessarily an open pocket or pouch, which then requires (in the conventional manner) use of a separate cover

strip to close off the pocket or pouch. This point is indeed, acknowledged by the Examiner at page 6, third line from bottom of the Official Action.

It is thus, again submitted that Groves would not guide or suggest to the skilled person the carrier of the present invention, in which the edges of a closed pocket or pouch" are formed by a fold and a join provided to a first portion and a second portion of a single elongate strip.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 (and 32) of the instant invention are novel over Groves, and as a departure from the teachings of Groves, presents a non-obvious improvement over the over this reference. As the independent claims are neither anticipated, nor rendered obvious by Groves, the various rejections of the dependent claims will not be discussed. The applicant respectfully asserts that under the circumstances, such itemized response is unnecessary. This was done without prejudice, though, and should not be taken as acquiescence on the part of the applicant to the points raised by the examiner. Should it be shown that the independent claims are anticipated, applicant reserves that right to address the points raised in the dependent claims at that time.

In light of the above, each basis of rejection raised by the examiner has been addressed. Favorable reconsideration and issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, particularly including any fees required under 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and/or 1.17, and any necessary extension of time fees, to deposit Account No. 07-1392.

Respectfully submitted,



James P. Riek

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,009
Tel. (919) 483-8022
Fax. (919) 483-7988

Dated: May 14, 2007